



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,516	10/08/1999	SUSAN R. SALL	450.268US1	6265

24333 7590 08/13/2003

GATEWAY, INC.  
ATTN: SCOTT CHARLES RICHARDSON  
610 GATEWAY DRIVE  
MAIL DROP Y-04  
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER

LEWIS, DAVID LEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/416,516	SALL, SUSAN R.	
	Examiner David L Lewis	Art Unit 2778	

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

1. Claims 1 and 13, and therefore claims 2-12 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims include the language "display a second, interactive tertiary set of information." Wherein the displayed information is described as being both second and tertiary, which is contradictory and confusing.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. **Claims 1, 13, 23, 33, 34 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leman (2001/0054986 A1).**
4. **As in claim 1, 13, 23, 33, 34 and 41, Leman teaches of a display apparatus comprising: a primary display device for a computer displaying a first set of information, figure 1 item 106; and at least one secondary display device for the computer, figure 1 item 110, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display a second, interactive tertiary set of information for the computer, page 1 paragraphs 7 and 8. Wherein the first display is a conventional interactive display, and the second display is a interactive display or interactive touch display panel. The second display is extended from the first via said hinge mechanism. Said interactive tertiary information represented by the touch panel information on the second display.**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

5. **Claims 1, 13, 23, 29, 33, 34, 35, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gouko (6222507 B1).**
6. **As in claims 1, 13, 23, 33, and 34, Gouko teaches of a display comprising: a primary display device for a computer for displaying primary information from an application running on the computer, figure 1 item 2; and at least running on the computer, figure 1 item 1; and at least one secondary display device for the computer, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display interactive tertiary information from the application, figure 2 item 3, column 5 lines 34-60. Wherein Gouko teaches of a display application wherein a plurality of images are displayed in respective display panels, divided into one display panel. As is well known in convention computer desktop applications images normally shown in one display screen in an overlapped fashion are brought to the forefront as the image or window menu bar is selected by the computer mouse, the previous window to being placed in the background. Gouko's invention allows these windows to be placed in separate displays. Inherent to these images and/or windows in each display of Gouko is the window menu bar allowing the window to be minimized, closed, or opened. Therefore a first display would display a first image with a first menu means for manipulating the first image, the second display would show a second**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

image with a second menu means, said second menu means sufficiently reading on said tertiary information.

7. **As in claim 35, Gouko teaches** of wherein the tertiary information comprises tools for the application, column 5 lines 12-23 and 49-55, wherein a know said computer desktop work area comprises icons or menus for the respective application. **As in claim 39, Gouko teaches** of wherein the at least one secondary display device is extended from a side of the housing, figure 2. **As in claim 29 and 40, Gouko teaches** of wherein the at least one secondary display device includes a first secondary display device extended from a side of the housing and a second secondary display device extended from a top of the housing, figure 6.
8. **As in claim 41, Gouko teaches** of a system comprising: a computer, **figure 1 item 1**; a primary display device operatively coupled to the computer for displaying primary information associated with an application running on the computer, **figure 1 item 2**; and at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the primary display device and stored in a housing behind the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display interactive tertiary information associated with the application, **figure 2 item 3, column 5 lines 34-60**. Wherein Gouko teaches of a display application wherein a plurality of images are displayed in respective display panels, divided into one display panel, as explained above in claim 1.

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
10. **Claims 36, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gouko (6222507 B1) in view of Failla (5128662).**
11. **As in claims 36, 37, and 38, Gouko fails to teach of said spring loaded switch providing a conductive path for a reconfiguration signal the secondary display, however any known mechanism for making the device feature operable wherein the secondary display is extended from behind the primary display would have been obvious design choice to the skilled artisan. Said conductive path and reconfiguration are inherent the device of Gouko. Said spring load switch feature represents a known display housing interfacing component for connecting segmented displays and would have been an obvious design choice in the implementation of the device as taught by Gouko. Failla teaches of a similar segmented display for a computer wherein spring loaded switching,**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

ribbon cable connection, and inverter board features are utilized to implement the system display, column 8 lines 40-60, figures 7, 13, 17. Therefore the spring loaded switch of Faila would have been an obvious design choice for implementing the device as taught by Gouko given said features are known for use in connecting component segmented display, as found in claims 35b, 36, and 37.

12. **Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 16, 17, 23, 24, 27, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rebeske (2950381).**
13. **As in claim 33, Rebeske teaches of a display comprising: a primary display device for a computer for displaying information from a session, figure 4 item 64; and at least one secondary display device for the computer, figure 4 item 70, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display interactive tertiary information from the session, figure 4 item 77, column 3 lines 11-30, column 4 lines 5-21. Wherein the user interacts with a first and second display, said second display being shown different information than the first and having the ability to show or not show tool bars and display options on a first and second display, wherein said tool bar on a second display reads on said interactive tertiary information as amended.**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

14. **As in claims 1, 13, and 23, Rebeske teaches of** a display apparatus, method, and system comprising: a primary display device for a computer for displaying a first set of information, **figure 4 item 64**; and at least one secondary display device for the computer, the at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the computer and stored in a housing adjacent to the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display a second, interactive tertiary set of information for the computer, **figure 4 item 70, column 3 lines 11-30**. **Wherein the exclusion of information provided on the first screen from the second screen makes the second screen a different set of information from the first, given they are no longer the same.** The word “different” is interpreted as meaning not the same, or not equal. **Wherein the user interacts with a first and second display, said second display being shown different information than the first and having the ability to show or not show tool bars and display options on a first and second display, wherein said tool bar on a second display reads on said interactive tertiary information as amended.**

15. **As in claim 2, Rebeske teaches of**, wherein the at least one secondary display device is operatively coupled to the primary display device, **figure 4 item 73**. **As in claim 6, 16, 17, and 27 Rebeske teaches of**, wherein the at least one secondary display device is extended from a side of the housing, **figure 4 item 77**. **As in claim 12, Rebeske teaches of**, further comprising at least one hinge coupling the at least one secondary display device to the housing, **figure 4 item 73**. **As in claim 24,**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

**Rebeske teaches of**, further comprising storing the at least one secondary display device behind the housing for the primary device, **figure 4, column 4 lines 5-21**.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. **Claims 22, 25, 26, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebeske (6295038) in view of Hendry et al. (5682529).**

18. **As in claims 22 and 30-32, Rebeske teaches of a system comprising: a computer, figure 1 item 1; a primary display device operatively coupled to the computer, figure 2 item 2a; at least one secondary display device operatively coupled to the primary display device and stored in a housing behind the primary display device, such that the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display interactive tertiary information for the computer, figure 2 item 3 and 4, column 1 lines 58-66, column 2 lines 1-48. Wherein the user interacts with a first and**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

**second display, said second display being shown different information than the first and having the ability to show or not show tool bars and display options on a first and second display, wherein said tool bar on a second display reads on said interactive tertiary information as amended. However Rebeske is silent as to said reconfiguration module located in the computer wherein the reconfiguration module is initiated when the at least one secondary display device is extended from the housing. Hendry et al. teaches of a reconfiguration module, figure 1 item 22, wherein the display manager within the operating system provides communication between each of the software or hardware components, to dynamically configure the plurality of display devices, column 3 lines 29-67, column 5 lines 55-67, column 6 lines 1-13. Further wherein Hendry et al. teaches this reconfiguration may occur automatically as a result of detecting the connection or disconnection of a device from the computer, for example upon insertion into or removal from a docking station, or the pivoting of a monitor from a portrait position to a landscape position. An example of a structure for a display notification is illustrated in Hendry et al.'s figure 3, wherein upon the rearrangement of the display system as taught by Rebeske, said notification would be shown to the user for input and or notice of said reconfiguration. Rebeske clearly teaches of a display devices within the scope of the invention as suggested by Hendry et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the computer display device as taught by Rebeske by utilizing the display manager connected to computer hardware aspects of the device as a reconfiguration module by including software as suggested by Hendry et**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

al. to reconfigure the display systems upon extending a display from the housing for purposes of expanding the display view, because Hendry et al. suggests the need for said reconfiguration in a computer display system with one or more display devices, as found in claims 22, and 30-32. Further claims 25 and 26 would have been obvious to the skilled artisan for the same reasons of obviousness as applied to claims 22, and 30-32.

19. **Claims 2-5, 7-11, 14, 15, 18-21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebeske (6295038) in view of Failla (5128662).**
20. **As in claims 2-5, 14, and 15, and claims 7-10, 18-20 and 28 Rebeske teaches of the devices as applied above to claims 1, 13 and 23. However Rebeske is silent as to the specifics of said spring loaded switching, cable connection, and inverter board features. Said features however represent well known display housing interfacing components for connecting segmented displays and would have been an obvious design choice in the implementation of the device as taught by Rebeske. Failla teaches of a similar segmented display for a computer wherein spring loaded switching, ribbon cable connection, and inverter board features are utilized to implement the system display, column 8 lines 40-60, figures 7, 13, 17. Each of said features would have been obvious to the skilled artisan given their well known use in the art for the implementation of such displays as suggested by Rebeske and Failla, as found in claims 2-5, 14, 15, and claims 7-10, 18-20, and 28. As in claims 11 and 21,**

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

Rebeske teaches of said invention as applied above to claims 1 and 13, however Rebeske is silent as to said plural secondary displays being extended from a top and side of said display. Failla teaches of an alternative embodiment where secondary displays are hingeably connected to a primary display for the purpose of increasing the view of a primary display. Given that the primary display of Rebeske includes more information than the secondary display, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to provided and additional hangably connect display or displays extending form the side of the primary display as suggested by Failla, modified by the extension from behind the primary display as taught by Rebeske, for the purpose of increasing the display area of the primary and information intense display, as found in claim 11 and 21.

***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/28/2003 with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are not persuasive. The Applicant has amended the claims to include "interactive tertiary information", which is inherently anticipated by Gouko. As well known in the art a computer display screen is interactive by virtue of use of the accompanying keyboard and mouse device to change the displayed image or information. Gouko teaches of such an interactive tertiary information which can be changed as well known in the art of notebook size personal computers. Rebeske teaches of all the displays being controllable and therefore interactive, the second display has different information than

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

the first. Wherein the user interacts with a first and second display, said second display being shown different information than the first and having the ability to show or not show tool bars and display options on a first and second display, wherein said tool bar on a second display reads on said interactive tertiary information as amended. Therefore the additional claims language does not distinguish the applicants invention over Gouko or Rebeske. Further said language describes the information as being both second and tertiary which is confusing and contradictory. The Design Choice of providing said spring loaded switch means would have been obvious to the skilled artisan in view of the structure provided by Gouko in view of problem solved by Gouko as a well known alternative. Hendry et al. teaches of a reconfiguration screen with several icon images, and therefore several reconfiguration options, figures 2 and 4. Further, as is well known and inherent to the system taught by Hendry is the ability to interface with the computer screen by use of a keyboard and mouse, to interface with the computer and change the screen configuration, by performing the appropriate menu selection and/or key sequence to initiate reconfiguration as taught by Hendry. New art Leman found that reads on the Applicants invention. Rejection Maintained, new rejection added.

***Conclusion***

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **David L. Lewis** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-3026**. The examiner can normally be reached on MT and THF from 8 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Serial Number: 09/416,516  
Art Unit: 2673  
Applicant: Sall

Page 15

**Title: Method And Apparatus Having Multiple Display Devices**

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

---



BIPIN SHALWALA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600